



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,575	11/29/2006	Heino Heckmann	2004DE106	6236
25255 7590 02/02/2011 CLARIANT CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 4000 MONROE ROAD CHARLOTTE, NC 28205				
EXAMINER				
VAJDA, PETER L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1721				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/02/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/591,575

Applicant(s)

HECKMANN ET AL.

Examiner

PETER L. VAJDA

Art Unit

1721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/16/2010
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The applicant's reply filed 11/16/2010 has been received and considered. The applicant has submitted a Rule 132 declaration. The applicant's arguments, however, are not considered persuasive for reasons outlined below in the Response to Arguments section.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that contrast value is an important characteristic in color filter technologies. The applicant further argues that neither Dietz nor Grandidier discloses any teaching regarding improving contrast. Towards this end, the applicant is reminded that according to the MPEP, rationale to modify or combine prior art may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art and references do not have to explicitly suggest combining teachings (MPEP 2144 [R-5]). *In re Nilssen*, 851 F.2d 1401, 1403, 7 USPQ2d 1500, 1502 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Furthermore, the MPEP states that, "it is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by the applicant." Also, according to the MPEP, "Although *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300, 1302 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) states that obviousness cannot be established by combining references "without also providing evidence of the motivating force which would impel one skilled in the art to do what the patent applicant has done" (emphasis added), reading the quotation in context it is clear that while there must be motivation to make the claimed invention, there is no

requirement that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention (MPEP 2144 [R-5]).”

The applicant also points to the Rule 132 Declaration of Dr. Macholdt showing a high contrast value of instant pigment preparation versus PV 23 alone. However, it is unclear if this represents a showing of superior properties. It is unclear from the declaration how the contrast is measured. It is assumed that the contrast value of 1.3% recited in the declaration represents a contrast of the PV 23 versus the applicant's pigment preparation. Furthermore, no indication is given as to the significance of the 1.3% contrast value. The applicant does not comment on why a contrast value of 1.3% is unsatisfactory for use in color filters or what a good contrast value would be. Furthermore, if the applicant is measuring the contrast in coloration between PV 23 alone and the pigment preparation of the instant claims or Dietz, it is not clear that a contrast value of 1.3% would be unexpected. If the contrast value simply measures the difference in color it is not necessarily unexpected that PV 23 alone would have a different color than the mixture of PV 23 with another dioxazine compound. Furthermore, if the difference in color between the two is only 1.3%, it is not clear that this represents a superior result. Therefore, without further explanation of the data presented by the applicant in the Rule 132 declaration, the applicant's arguments are not found to be persuasive and the pending rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz *et al.* (US Patent 5,318,627) in view of Grandidier *et al.* (US PGP 2004/0261662).

Dietz teaches a pigment dispersant/pigment combination recited as a colorant by the applicant in pending claim 1 and a method of coloring a high molecular weight organic material such as a polymer or resin composition (Col. 4 In. 18 – Col. 5 In. 35 and Col. 7 In. 23-43). Specifically, Dietz teaches a base pigment of formula (I) which has the exact structure as the applicant's base pigment in pending claim 1. Furthermore, Dietz teaches pairing the pigment of formula I with a pigment dispersant of formula (II), wherein formula II is represented by Q-[Y-X]_m. In formula (II) of Dietz, Q is an m-valent radical of the base pigment of formula (I), Y is a bridge forming group defined by the same linking groups as the applicant's Y group in formula (II) of pending claim 1, and X is the radical or an aliphatic or aromatic five or six-membered heterocyclic system bound to bridging member Y via a carbon atom and is defined the same as the applicant's X in pending claim 1 (Col. 4 In. 35-68). Dietz further teaches that dioxazine compounds of the class of pigment dispersants of formula (II) that are particularly useful have the composition of formula (III), which is the same as the applicant's formula (III) recited in pending claim 4. The applicant further defines Y and X in pending claims 2 and 3 to include different linkages (in the case of Y) and different radicals (in the case of X), however, Dietz also teaches that Y and X may be selected

from many, if not all, of the linkages and radicals listed in pending claims 2 and 3 (Col. 4 ln. 35 – Col. 5 ln. 54). Furthermore, m in formula (II) of Dietz is taught to be a number of from 0.1 to 4 (Col. 5 ln. 27-34). Additionally, the pigment dispersant of formula (II) is taught by Dietz to be added to the pigment preparation in an amount of from 0.1 to 25% by weight of the base pigment of formula (I) (Col. 6 ln. 3-13). The pigment preparation taught by Dietz is taught to be especially useful in printing inks or toners by adding the pigment preparation to high-molecular weight organic materials (i.e. binder resins of toners) (Col. 7 ln. 23-43).

Grandidier teaches that the same pigment taught for use in a pigment preparation by Dietz can be used in polymers, printing inks and color filters (Abstract). Furthermore, it is taught that by preparing Pigment Violet 23, which has the same chemical formula as the applicant's formula (I) and Dietz's formula (I), with the process taught by Grandidier, the coloristic value of the pigment becomes surprisingly high and possesses excellent crystallinity combined with a small particle size which suits the pigment especially well to uses in color filters (p. 7 [0099]). Furthermore, the pigment exhibits both an excellent rheology which allows for its use in high concentration while also exhibiting superior coloristic properties and excellent fastnesses (p. 7 [0099]).

Both Dietz and Grandidier teach the use of the same dioxane based pigments in their respective formula (I)'s. Both also teach that the pigment may be used to color polymers and binder resins and may be used in toners, printing inks and other polymer/plastic based materials. Grandidier further teaches that said pigments may also be especially suited to use in color filters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to any person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the

pigment preparation taught by Dietz *et al.* in a color filter as taught by Grandidier *et al.* or to have made the pigment by the process taught by Grandidier *et al.* for use in a color filter. Both Dietz and Grandidier teach that the pigment is suitable for use in the same materials, but Dietz does not teach that the pigment preparation be used in a color filter. Grandidier teaches that the pigment is especially suited to use in color filters, particularly when prepared in the manner taught by Grandidier. The method of production taught by Grandidier produces a pigment with excellent coloristic value, crystallinity, particle size distribution, rheology and fastness.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz *et al.* (US Patent 5,318,627) in view of Grandidier *et al.* (US PGP 2004/0261662) as applied to claims 1-7 and 9 above, and further in view of Coffey (US PGP 2002/0119314).

The complete discussions of Dietz *et al.* and Grandidier *et al.* above are incorporated herein. Dietz, however, does not teach that the pigment may be shaded with other pigments or dyes.

Coffey teaches colorized rubber particles that are colored by inorganic or organic pigments. As a suitable pigment, Coffey teaches the use of C.I. Pigment Violet 23 (which has the same formula as the formulas (I) of Dietz and the applicant) and teaches that pigment dispersions may be blended together to produce many different colors and shades of color (p. 3 [0024-27]).

All of Dietz, Grandidier and Coffey teach the use of colorants containing pigments to color high molecular weight organic materials (such as polymers, resins

and rubbers). Coffey teaches that by blending multiple pigments together different shades of color can be produced. Dietz is not directed towards an invention wherein one specific color is desired, but instead teaches that pigment preparation (pigment and pigment dispersant) are especially useful in coloring high molecular weight organic compounds, which pose no prohibition on the use of various different shades. Therefore, it would have been obvious to any person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the pigment preparation taught by Dietz *et al.* in a color filter as taught by Grandidier *et al.* or to have made the pigment by the process taught by Grandidier *et al.* for use in a color filter and to have employed the well known process of blending pigments to achieve different shades taught by Coffey to the pigment preparation taught by Dietz *et al.* This would have allowed for the production of many different shades and colors of color filters.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PETER L. VAJDA whose telephone number is (571)272-7150. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark F. Huff/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1721

/PLV/ 1/28/2011